

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 have been amended. Claims 17 and 18 have been added. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14 and 17-19 are pending and under consideration.

Applicants assert that no new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in the Specification as filed on (pg. 9, line 22 to pg. 11, line 21), on (pg. 18, line 11 to pg. 19, line 15), and (Fig. 8, 10-12)

II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind in view of Hirata (U.S. 6,925,567). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 as amended, for example, recites a "method of managing control information in a control information management server... comprising:

producing the control information in compliance with an instruction from a user that is issued by the user responding to first information;

collecting alteration information unknown to the user and responsive to alteration to the first information;

sending a message via email to a mobile communication terminal of the user, said message including the alteration information unknown to the user and responsive to the alteration to the first information, said message further including a request for permission to alter the control information..." (emphasis added).

Neither Susskind nor Hirata, individually or combined, describe, teach, or suggest at least producing control information with an instruction from a user that is "*issued by the user responding to first information*" and collecting alteration information "*responsive to alteration to the first information*" and sending a message which is "*responsive to the alteration to the first information*" as recited by claim 1.

As a non-limiting example used to facilitate the Examiner's understanding, "the first information" as recited by the embodiment of claim 1 may be a TV program schedule. A user relies on the TV program schedule *to issue an instruction* (e.g. set a recording device to record a scheduled TV program). If the TV schedule is subsequently changed due to an unexpected

event such as a breaking news report, the alteration information *responsive to the first information* to alter the control information is produced. The alteration information is then sent to the user via an email message for the purpose of obtaining permission from the user to alter the control information.

The Office Action asserts that the email in Hirata includes "the alteration information unknown to the user" (see Office Action Item 2, second paragraph). More specifically, the Office Action states that an "Figure 9 of Hirata shows an email message that includes "the details of the request itself, e.g. the date, time, channel, and speed of the temporary of recording message" (see Office Action pg. 2, last paragraph). Although Hirata includes some details of the request itself, Hirata fails to describe an email message that is "*responsive to the alteration of the first information.*" Hirata merely describes an email message generated at step S28 that includes, reservation information, a notice of acceptance of the request, and a message requesting confirmation. Hirata fails to describe producing control information in compliance with an instruction from a user that is issued by the user responding to first information, and therefore, there is no need in Hirata for the email message to be responsive to the alteration of the first information.

Accordingly, Hirata fails to describe, teach, or suggest "sending a message via email...said message including the alteration information unknown to the user and responsive to the alteration to the first information..." as recited by amended claim 1 (emphasis added, see clause 3). Susskind fails to cure the deficiencies of Hirata describe above.

Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art for at least the above-mentioned reasons.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1, and therefore, inherit the patentable recitations of their base claim. Accordingly, claims 2-4 patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the above-mentioned reasons.

Claims 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 recite "sending a message via email...said message including the alteration information unknown to the user and responsive to the alteration to the first information." The cited art does not describe, teach, or suggest at least the above-mentioned feature. Accordingly, claims 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14 patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the above-mentioned reasons.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection be withdrawn.

III. NEW CLAIMS

New claims 17 and 18 patentably distinguish over the cited art. Claim 17 recites "allowing a user to specify a condition for alerting the user concerning an update to control information of a control object" (see first clause). The cited art does not describe, teach, or suggest such a feature.

Hirata describes an email message that includes, reservation information, a notice of acceptance of the request, and a message requesting confirmation. The user in Hirata, however, does not specify any conditions for when to alert the user regarding an update to control information. Susskind also fails to describe allowing a user to specify a condition for alerting the user of changes to reservation information (see Figure 4).

Therefore, claim 17 patentably distinguishes over the cited art for at least the above-mentioned reason. Dependent claim 18 inherits the patentable recitations of its base claim, and therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited art for at least the above-mentioned reason. In addition, claim 18 recites the additional feature of "automatically updating the control information when a second condition is met" which the cited art does not describe, teach, or suggest.

IV. CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

8/7/7

By: _____



J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501